

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 28, 2006 has been read and carefully considered and the present amendment submitted in order to better distinguish the present invention over the cited references.

In that Office Action, claims 1, 5, 6 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garde *et al*, U.S. Patent 6, 325,241 in view of Baker *et al*, U.S. Patent 5,984,122. Claims 3, 7, 8, 10, 12, 15, 18, 21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garde *et al*, in view of Baker *et al* and further in view of Lambelet, U.S. Patent 5,551,597 as applied to claim 2 and further in view of McAllister *et al*, U.S. Patent 5,782,359.

The rejection of the claims in the present application is respectfully traversed. It is submitted that the main reference relied upon in the rejection is that of Garde *et al* and that the Garde *et al* reference fails to disclose one of the important features of the present invention.

It is also submitted that the position taken by the Examiner that it would be obvious to modify the teaching of Garde *et al* is totally against the teaching of the Garde *et al* reference and therefore is completely unfounded.

As explained in the prior amendment, there is simply no suggestion or motivation for such a modification anywhere in the prior art and any such modification can only be one that is based on a reading of the teachings of the present specification.


It is common practice in this art to allow stepwise rotation in one direction only, and furthermore, such a "ratchet" is much easier to put into practice than the appropriately higher resistance "backward ratchet" in bi-directional "ratchet" operation.

Arriving at the present device by Applicant required considerable effort and several prototypes before the bi-directional rotation of the cover with sufficient different "ratchet" operations in both directions was ready and successful.

It is submitted that the present invention resolves a particular problem not disclosed or even considered in the prior art and clearly not found anywhere in the Garde *et al* reference which, in effect, teaches away, not toward, the present invention that utilizes rotation of the cover “in either direction”.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the ability to move the cover in “either” direction as recited in the independent claim 1 is unobvious over the Garde *et la* reference, taken with any one of the Baker *et al*, Lambelet or McAllister *et al* references, and an allowance of the present application is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



DAVID A. JACKSON
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 26,742

KLAUBER & JACKSON LLC
411 Hackensack Avenue, 4TH Floor
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601
Phone: (201) 487-5800